

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/539,864	03/31/2000	Yasuaki Seki	0010-1098-0	9265	
7:	590 08/13/2002				
Oblon Spivak McClelland Maier & Neustadt PC			EXAMINER		
1755 Jefferson Arlington, VA	Davis Highway Fourth I 22202	Floor	PATEL, ISHWARBHAI B		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2827		
			DATE MAILED: 08/13/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	·			
A desir and A desir a	09/539,864	SEKI ET AL.				
, Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
• *	Ishwar (I. B.) Patel	2827				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	1 ' '	he correspondence ad	Idress			
THE REPLY FILED 07 May 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this Ace event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth than SIX MONTHS from the mailing d S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF	ate of the final rejection.  THE FINAL REJECTION	. See MPEP			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The defense been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shorteness of the sho	ension and the corresponding amount of and statutory period for reply originally s	or the fee. The appropriate et in the final Office action;	or (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:					
(a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wou canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ıld be allowable if submitted i					
5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered by raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	pecause it is not directed SOL	ELY to issues which	were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims	ent(s) a) will not be entered would be rejected is provided	I or b)□ will be enter d below or appended.	red and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	vs:					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
10. Other:		ALDERT W. PALAI PRIMARY EXAMI	mer DINI P- 120 -			
		• • •				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant has not pointed out any structural dirrerences between the claimed invention and the prior art structure..